REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 13-17, 19, and 31-35 have been amended. Claims 37-45 have been previously canceled. No claims have been added with this amendment. Therefore, claims 1-36 will remain pending in the application after entry of the foregoing claim amendments. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

Interview Summary

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the time and attention afforded by Examiner Tecklu during a telephonic interview on March 31, 2009. The Examiner stated that the proposed amendments, contained herein, appeared to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103 (a) but indicated that further search and consideration of the relevant art would be required.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1-7, 9-25 and 27-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Venter et al., U.S. Pub. No. 20040194072 (hereinafter "Venter"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Although Applicants believe that the present claims patentably define over Venter, Applicants have amended the claims to further clarify the claimed subject matter.

The cited portions of Venter fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1 as amended. For example, the cited portions of Venter fail to disclose or suggest that the framework provides multi-language compilation by integrating the first compiler component and the second compiler component to create a multi-language compiler, as now recited in claim 1. Specifically, Venter is directed to a method for multi-language compilation that allows two or more separately written compiler components to co-operate in the compilation of mixed language compilation units. Venter uses a base class library and compilers for specific languages that are written as extensions of these classes. See Venter, Abstract. The cited portions of Venter disclose the following.

> Referring to FIG. 1, a multi-language compilation system 100 in accordance with an aspect of the present invention is illustrated. The system 100 includes a primary parser component 110, a primary compiler component 120 and a common compiler infrastructure (CCI) backend component 130. As illustrated in FIG. 2, optionally, the system 100 can include a first secondary parser component 140.sub.1 through an Nth secondary parser component 140.sub.N, N being an integer greater than or equal to one, and/or, a first secondary compiler component 150.sub.1 through an Mth secondary compiler component 150.sub.M, M being an integer greater than or equal to one. The first secondary parser component 140.sub.1 through the Nth secondary parser component 140.sub.N can be referred to collectively as the secondary parser component(s) 140. Similarly, the first secondary compiler component 150.sub.1 through the Mth secondary compiler component 150.sub.M can be referred to collectively as the secondary compiler component(s) 150.

(Venter, ¶ 31)

In Venter, the compiler for a specific language is written as extensions of the base classes of the common compiler infrastructure (CCI). The CCI provides a common format that allows creation of customized compiler components. In Venter, the system includes a primary compiler component and one or more secondary compiler components each of which are separately written using the CCI. In contrast, the invention, as claimed, integrates a number of compiler components that conform to a set of interfaces of a prespecified protocol. The use of a prespecified protocol allows the user to configure compilation constraints. The cited portions of Venter fail to disclose the creation of a multi-language compiler by integrating compiler components conforming to a set of interfaces included in a prespecified protocol.

Moreover, the cited portions of Venter fail to disclose or suggest that the discovery of the first compiler component and the second compiler component is effected using an inter-process communication. As discussed above the compiler components in Venter are written as extensions of the base classes of the CCI and there is, therefore, no need for the system in Venter to employ a discovery mechanism using an inter-process communication, as now recited in claim 1. Thus, the cited portions of Venter fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit therefore that claim 1 patentably defines over Venter. As claims 2-7 and 9-12 depend from claim 1, claims 2-7 and 9-12 are also patentably define over Venter at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

The subject matter of claim 1 discussed above is similarly recited in independent claims 13-16, 19 and 31-34. Therefore, claims 13-16, 19 and 31-34 likewise patentably define over Venter. As claims 17-18, 20-25, 27-30, 35, and 36 depend from claims 16, 19, and 34, these claims also patentably define over Venter at least by virtue of their dependence from claims 16, 19, and 34.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 8 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable as obvious over Venter in view of Alpern (US 7,107,578). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, claims 1 and 19 patentably define over Venter. Alpern was cited in the Office Action mailed January 8, 2009 (Office Action) as allegedly disclosing a method for multiple languages to interface with a single debugger client using a standard interface. See Office Action, page 10, ¶ 1. The cited portions of Alpern fail to remedy the deficiencies of Venter discussed above. In particular, Alpern also fails to disclose the creation of a multi-language compiler as claimed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 19 patentably define over any proposed combination of the teachings of Venter and Alpern by one skilled in the art. As claims 8 and 26 depend from claims 1 and 19, these claims also patentably define over the combination of Venter and Alpern at least by virtue of their dependence from claims 1 and 19.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable and that the present application is in condition for allowance. Entry of the above amendments, reconsideration of the application and a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Michael P. Dunnam, at (215) 564-8962 to discuss the resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: April 8, 2009

/Michael P. Dunnam/
Michael P. Dunnam
Registration No. 32,611

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439